

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,705	11/21/2001	Judith K. Gwathmey	JGT-004 3899	
37462 7	2 7590 07/13/2004		EXAMINER	
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI RIVERFRONT OFFICE			AFREMOVA, VERA	
ONE MAIN ST	TREET, ELEVENTH FLO	OR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CAMBRIDGE	, MA 02142		1651	
			DATE MAILED: 07/13/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/990,705	GWATHMEY ET AL.			
Advisory Notion	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Vera Afremova	1651			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 28 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFF f extension and the corresponding amounte shortened statutory period for reply one later than three months after the mailing	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furthe	er consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fir	nally rejected claims.			
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would l canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	reconsideration has been consider Continuation Sheet.	dered but does NOT place the			
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	s) a) will not be entered or b) lud be rejected is provided below	☐ will be entered and an wor appended.			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: none.					
Claim(s) objected to: none.					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-13</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 14-26.					
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appro	oved or b) disapproved by th	e Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	- 1 spm			
0. Other:		VERA AFREMOVA PH.D. PATENT EXAMINER			
		ENIONAL MANAGEMENT			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

With regard to 112-2 issues applicants argue that the claimed method clearly refers to exposing tissue to a first solution with a selected amount of calcium chloride and then exposing the tissue to additional solution(s) having calcium concentration about 1-2 mM less than the selected amount. Applicants argue that the claimed method clearly refers to exposing cells after disassociation to a second solution with a selected amount of calcium and then repeatedly resuspending in additional solution(s) having calcium concentration about 1-2 mM more at each consecutive step. But this is not what claim recites. The claimed method neither indicates the selected amount nor it encompasses the concept of decreasing and/or increasing calcium concentration by 1-2 mM every consecutive step before and after dissociation.

With regard to the reference by Kruppenbacher et al. applicants argue that it dos not teach the concept of decreasing and/or increasing calcium concentration in the method for cardiac ell isolation. This is not found true. The reference clearly teaches steps of increasing calcium concentrations, for example: "cardiomycetes were recalcified in three steps 0.2/0.5/1.0 (see page 133, col. 1, line 48). The reference might not clearly disclose a specific protocol of decreasing calcium concentration. However, at the very least it teaches this concept by the fact that cardiomycetes had to be "recalcified". Moreover, the reference teaches step of transferring tissues from buffer to water (see page 133, col. 1, line 38) and, thus, it teaches step of decreasing calcium concentration.

A.V